

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,074	10/10/2003	John D. Efstathiou	79568	3054
22242 7	590 05/13/2005		EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY			WEIER, ANTHONY J	
SUITE 1600	A SALLE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL	60603-3406		1761	-

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			l b
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Y
	10/684,074	EFSTATHIOU, JOHN D.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony Weier	_1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a y within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI t, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	1.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 F</u>	ebruary 2005.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is	,
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			.
4) Claim(s) 28-30,32 and 41-61 is/are pending in	the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	= *		
5) Claim(s) <u>28-30,32, 41-49, and 52-61</u> is/are allo	owed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>50 and 51</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•	i).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		·· ——	
application from the International Bureau	-		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	received.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· 4) Then iou	Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5)	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [_] Other:	 :	

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, 11, and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6660321.

The claims stand rejected for the reasons set forth in the last Office Action (mailed 10/4/04).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bain et al.

The claims stand rejected for the reasons set forth in the last Office Action (mailed 10/4/04).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 10/684,074

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain et al.

The claims stand rejected for the reasons set forth in the last Office Action (mailed 10/4/04).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 28-30, 32, 41-49, and 52-61 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/7/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the process of the instant invention differs from that of Bain et al. Although it is agreed that the processes are different (and the rejection of the process claims have been withdrawn), the same product, as claimed, is produced.

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Weier whose telephone number is 571-272-1409. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anthony Weier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761

10/05

Anthony Weier May 10, 2005